

JACK RUBY WAS NOT EITHER AN INFORMANT FOR THE FBI

Synopsis: Jack Ruby was contacted by the Dallas FBI eight times in 1959. He provided no information, was not paid, and was not, in Hoover's definition, an informant. The FBI was less than enthusiastic about providing the Warren Commission with details and other records mentioning Ruby before November 24, 1963. This memo summarizes the correspondence I have on this matter.

* * * * *

CD 4, the first collection of investigative reports submitted by the FBI to the Commission, contains various items mentioning Ruby before the assassination, dating back to 1950 (pp. 155-159). This information is prefaced only by the remark that "the following is information concerning JACK RUBY, also known as Jack Rubenstein." On February 25, 1964, Rankin wrote Hoover, noting that a review of those pages "suggests the existence of a file containing information about Jack L. Ruby collected by your Bureau prior to November 22, 1963." He asked for "a report on the information relating to Ruby which may have been in your possession prior to November 22, 1963."

In his reply, dated February 27, Hoover advised that the information in CD 4 "was obtained through a search of all files in the Dallas Office wherein references to Jack Ruby appeared. All available information concerning Jack Ruby contained in the Dallas files is set forth in the report." (Emphasis added.) On March 3, Rankin wrote Hoover again, pointing out that the request had not been intended to apply only to the Dallas files. He asked for copies of all records of interviews of Ruby, or of persons mentioning Ruby.

Hoover's reply, dated April 7 (CD 732, with attachments), provided more details on the ten items in CD 4, but no new items. Four of these items are in the 26 volumes (CE's 1760, 1761, 1693, 1764). As can be seen there, the attachments Hoover provided to CD 732 are not original reports, but paraphrases. As he put it in his letter, "these copies are verbatim copies of the original source material with the exception of those instances wherein it was necessary to conceal the identity of a confidential source.... As the items basically contain information pertaining to other unrelated investigative matters much of which was furnished to this Bureau in confidence, it is requested that the President's Commission continue to maintain this information in the same confidence that it was initially furnished." This seems like a rather odd procedure and request. (Incidentally, no part of CD 732 is now withheld.)

Nine of the ten items are of no particular interest to me. The exception is one which is presented in CD 4 as follows: "The following description was obtained through observation and interview." In CD 732, the identical description is prefaced, somewhat more informatively, as follows: "Jack L. Ruby was contacted by Special Agent Charles W. Flynn on March 11, 1959, at which time the following description of Jack L. Ruby was obtained through observation of the Agent and this interview. No additional information was furnished by Ruby."

This description was in fact obtained in conjunction with an attempt to recruit Ruby as an FBI informant. The above-cited letters from Rankin raise no questions about this; what follows is the information presented, apparently without prodding, by Hoover.

As noted, CD 4 does not indicate the source of the description of Ruby. In his February 27 letter, Hoover wrote: "For your information, Ruby was contacted by an Agent of the Dallas Office on March 11, 1959, in view of his position as a night club operator who might have knowledge of the criminal element in Dallas. He was advised of the Bureau's jurisdiction in criminal matters, and he expressed a willingness to furnish information along these lines. He was subsequently contacted on eight occasions between March 11, 1959, and October 2, 1959, but furnished no information whatever and further contacts with him were discontinued. Ruby was never paid any money, and he was never at any time an informant of this Bureau."

Rankin's letter of March 3 did not ask for any summary of this rather startling revelation. Hoover's letter essence the above-quoted paragraph, with some expansion. Contacted by an Agent on April 28, June 5, and 18, July 31, and October 2, 1959 These contacts were recorded with notations indicating Ruby had not furnished any information recorded that was furnished by Ruby in these contacts. Ruby was never paid any money and he was not an informant of this Bureau."

Some obvious questions present themselves. Why, since he was contacted at that time? (One possible clue is that the information obtained on the first visit includes that fact that Ruby, James Robert Todd, described as a "known Dallas area character," was willing to record a physical description of such informants? Paid or unpaid information whatever, why was he repeatedly contacted? Paid in cash, did Ruby at that time have any reason to compensation? Might there be any significance to the fact that his contacts with Ruby bracketed his September, 1959, trip to Mexico City? It is unfortunate that Hoover did not give the Commission the original records, which presumably included files number 1760, 1761, 1693, and 1764, which contained useful information. Why did the Commission show no greater interest in this information? (I am not aware of any subsequent contacts with Ruby after CD 732 was received, but I have not checked the Archives files or made a thorough check of the 26 voluminous records.)

(Copies of the documents cited are available from me. This information was initiated when Harold Weisberg sent me a copy of his letter to the Commission, dated February 27, 1964, which was discovered in the Archives files of the Commission, after CD 732 was received, and/or Hal Verb.)

To fill out the page, here is an excerpt from the nonexistant transcript of the session which the Commission did not hold on June 31, 1964:

Mr. HOOVER. Ruby was never paid any money, and he was not an informant of this Bureau.

The COMMISSION (in unison). What, never?

Mr. HOOVER. No, never.

The STAFF (in unison). What, never?

Mr. HOOVER. Well, hardly ever.